

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this application in view of the following remarks and the above amendments. This response is believed to fully address all issues raised in the Office Action mailed April 16, 2010. Furthermore, no new matter is believed to have been introduced hereby.

Claims 21-50 remain pending as amended above.

Initially, the rejection of claims 21-50 under 35 USC § 101 is believed to be fully addressed via the above-detailed amendment to the independent claims, which now recite “hardware logic” and various operations (including “generating one or more signals”). However, if any further issues remain, the examiner is kindly requested to call the undersigned at 303-800-6678 to expedite prosecution of the present application.

35 USC §§102 and 103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 21-49 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Dao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,311).

Claim 50 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dao et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,940,311).

Initially, each of these rejections is respectfully traversed as the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach or even suggest the claimed combination of features such as set forth in any of the pending claims.

Without limiting the scope of embodiments of the invention, only in an effort to impart precision to the claims (e.g., by more particularly pointing out embodiments of the invention, rather than to avoid prior art), and merely to expedite the prosecution of the present application, Applicant has amended independent claim 21 to in part recite that “an operand analyzer hardware logic is to analyze the converted first operand and the second operand to determine whether one of the first or second operands corresponds to a denormal operand and wherein the operand analyzer is to generate one or more signals to allow shifting of an output of the first logic in response to a determination that one of the first or second operands corresponds to the denormal operand”. Support for this amendment may be readily found in the present specification, see, e.g., specification at paragraph 21.

It is respectfully submitted that the cited art, alone or in combination, fails to teach (or even suggest) the claimed combination of features such as set forth in claim 21, including for example,

anything about an analyzer as specifically claimed. Accordingly, claim 21 is believed to be in condition for allowance.

The remaining independent claims recite similar (though not identical) language as claim 21 and have been rejected for similar reasons as claim 21. Hence, these remaining independent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as claim 21, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Also, all pending dependent claims should be allowable for at least similar reasons as their respective independent claims, as well as additional or alternative elements that are recited therein but not shown in the cited prior art.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (303-800-6678) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Applicant hereby petitions, as well as includes the appropriate fee herewith, to obtain a two-month extension of the period for responding to the Office action, thereby moving the deadline for response from June 16, 2010 to August 16, 2010.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-4238.

Respectfully submitted,
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 50890
Telephone Number: 303-800-6678

Date 8/16/10 By /Ramin Aghevli – Reg. No. 43,462/
Ramin Aghevli, Reg. No. 43,462